

Serial No. 09/874,837
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PF02193NA

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 14 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 5 and 8 through 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,907,677 to Glenn, et al. ("Glenn, et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,193,151 to Jain ("Jain patent") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,805 to Bantum ("Bantum patent"). Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Glenn, et al. patent in view of the Jain patent in further view of Bantum patent and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,450 to Pasanen ("Pasanen patent"). Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Glenn, et al. patent in view of the Jain patent in further view of Bantum patent and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,712,587 to Schauder, et al. ("Schauder, et al. patent").

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, adjusting transmission timing of chat messages based on said link latency in order to synchronize communication of each chat message to the plurality of client devices, and claim 8 as amended provides, *inter alia*, similar language. Each chat message is sent to a plurality of client devices for each chat session and, thus, it is important to note that communication of each chat message to the client devices is synchronized.

As stated at page 3, line 12, of the above Office Action, "Glenn in view of Jain does not teach synchronize communication of messages". On the other hand, the Office Action goes on to cite the Abstract of the Bantum patent to show that the Bantum patent teaches synchronized communication of messages.

Serial No. 09/874,837
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PF02193NA

Claims 1 and 8 as amended distinguish from the cited references. The Bantum patent describes a method for synchronizing client-based timers with a server-based timer. In particular, each client-based timer is synchronized with a time kept on a central server and, thus, the Bantum patent is focused on each client-server relationship. However, the Bantum patent does not describe or suggest synchronization of communication to the plurality of clients and, in fact, does not even describe or suggest any type of multi-client relationship. The Bantum patent does not describe or suggest synchronized communication of each chat message to a plurality of client devices, as required by claims 1 and 8. Likewise, the Glenn, et al. patent, the Pasanen patent, and the Schauder, et al. patent do not describe or suggest any type of system or method that synchronizes communication of each chat message to a plurality of client devices. Therefore claims 1 and 8 as amended distinguish patentably from the Glenn, et al. patent, the Jain patent, the Pasanen patent, the Schauder, et al. patent, and any combination of these patents.

Claims 2 through 7 and 9 through 14 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 8 as amended. Therefore claims 2 through 7 and 9 through 14 distinguish patentably from the Glenn, et al. patent, the Jain patent, the Pasanen patent, the Schauder, et al. patent, and any combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for amended claims 1 and 8.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 14 are respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/874,837
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PF02193NA

CONCLUSION


No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Phillips, W. Garland

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048

 07/11/05
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350